

A Pair of
Clean Shoes and Boots

FOR

18

A Dirty Baronet,

Who was lately terribly Mir'd, by
wading beyond his Depth in CON-
TROVERSY :

OR,

An ANSWER .

To a Scandalous Pamphlet, Intituled,
Over Shoes, Over Boots,

By Sir RICHARD COX, Bar^{nt}.

IN WHICH

The Vile Cavils and Ridiculous Exceptions of
that Puny Scribbler, against the CHURCH
of ENGLAND, and its CLERGY, are
Consider'd ; And his Egregious Blunders and
Inconsistences fully Detected, and Exposed.

By a Lover of the CLERGY.

— *But the Folly of Fools is Deceit, Prov. 14. 8.*

LONDON, Printed for T. PAYNE, near
Stationers-Hall. 1722.

K Coates (Sir R.)





A Pair of
Clean Shoes and Boots
FOR A
Dirty Baronet.



Wilst Infidelity is so much in vogue with the Libertines of this Age; and the Liberty of the Press so great, that every Bold Pretender who has more Conceit than Brains, thinks himself sufficiently qualify'd to make successful Attacks upon the Christian Religion; It is not much to be wonder'd at, that the most Heterodox, nay, that the most Irreligious and Abominable Opinions should be Propagated and Patronized, and put upon the Easy and Credulous part of Mankind, as Bold and Seasonable Truths.

If the Case did not stand thus, it might be just Matter of Astonishment, how so many Bold Scribblers, who have nothing else to recommend 'em to the World, but a Daring Front, and a sufficient Stock of Ill Principles, (imbibed with their Mother's Milk,) shou'd dare to launch forth in so much Invective against the Church Established. A flaming and notorious Instance of which, we have in the Pamphlet under Consideration. And whether the Name of the Author be Real or Fictitious, it matters not : For tho' he may probably be a *Baronet*, yet to the Name of a Christian, or Gentleman, I think he can scarce lay any Claim, nor as such shall I treat him. For, what Right can he have to the first, who, under a pretence of more than common Concern for Religion, endeavours to run down the Institutions of Christ ; and to lay that aside, without which, no Man has the least Claim to the Name of a Christian ? Or to the second ? For no one who has the least sense of Good-Manners, (without much better Grounds) wou'd go about to Defame an Order of Men so Sacred, and so much Reverenced and Esteem'd by all Good and Considerate Persons ; and Undervalu'd by none, but such as Undervalue Religion ; or such as have no other Design, than to wound ev'n Christianity it self through the sides of its Clergy. His Principles, in the main, are drawn from that choice Piece, falsely call'd, *The Rights of the Christian Church, Asserted*. And notwithstanding that Villainous Book has been fully Answered, and Confuted more than once ;

once; yet our *Author* has thought fit to rake into so filthy a Kennel, in order to Traduce the Church, and its most Deserving Members. And tho' the *Rights* is drawn up with much more Subtilty and Cunning, yet This does not fall one Ace short of it in Rancour and Malice. And yet, for all this, I will take upon me, for once, the short Penance of tracing his Wandrings; and 'tis none of my fault, that they are so senseless and stupid, as not to be capable of a more compleat and substantial Confutation. For 'tis plain enough, that he has drawn up his Scribble with so much Weakness and Perverseness, that it is not easy to be determined, whether he has betrayed more of his Insufficiency, or Insincerity, his Wickedness, or Folly. For if he is in Good-Earrest, I pity his Understanding; if not, he has a strange Conscience, and on that account is much more an Object of Pity. He has contrived the whole Performance so ill, that it is neither suited to Perswade the Wise, nor Deceive the Simple. His Falsifications are so open and bare-faced, that if I had never-so-great a design to expose the Folly of his Pretences, and the Feebleness of his Reasonings, I could not father upon him more unlucky Instances of Boldness and Disingenuity.

The greatest Vent of his Spite and Rancour is to belch forth filthy Slanders and Reproaches against the Conforming Clergy; they are set up by him as a common Mark to Shoot at: To Censure and Reform them, is the most plausible Pretence for his Peevishness and Ill-Nature; and
to

to Abuse them, is what he seems to reckon the principal Test of his Goodness and Wit, tho' I may safely pronounce it the greatest Instance of his Folly and Wickedness. He has rummaged that excellent Book of Mr. *Chillingworth's*, Intituled, *The Religion of Protestants, a safe way to Salvation*; but at the same time has foully misapplied it: and whatever that Learned Author has said against the Usurpations of the Church of Rome, this *senseless* One has dragged in by Head and Shoulders against the Church established. But to digress no farther, he tells us, in his Dedication;

That before he met by chance with Dr. Snape's Book written in the Bangorian Controversy, these Matters were foreign to his Thoughts. And so I may venture to say they are still, if we may judge of his way of Thinking, by his Writings; for he seems to have made but a small Proficiency, ev'n on that side of the Controversy into which he has lately lifted himself; and all along has widely mistaken the State of the Question. And tho' he gives into this Opinion, That the Bishop of Bangor's Principles are contain'd in the judicious Hooker and Chillingworth; I hope he will permit other People (who have much less Bias of Prejudice upon their Minds, and are somewhat better versed in the Writings of these two Great Men) to think quite otherwise. The best and most valuable Authors, indeed, by leaving out one thing, and putting in another, may be compelled to speak any thing, and may be tortured to a sense the Authors them-

themselves never dreamt of : and by this and no other kind of Practice, *Hooker* and *Chillingworth* may be dragg'd into the *Bangorian* side of the Question ; when by a fair and candid Interpretation, 'tis only impossible to make them speak any thing like it.

P. 5. He informs us, *That when he reflects, how the Christian Religion seems to be calculated for the settling and establishing Peace and Good-Will amongst Men, he was startled to find it chiefly made use of to promote Rebellion, Discord, Animosities, and Bloodshed.* 'Tis plain from hence, that a small Matter will startle him ; he is so conscious of Guilt, as to be almost afraid of his own Shadow ; which, if I may judge of his Body by his Mind, is monstrous enough to shock a Person of much more Courage and Resolution ; and will once take upon me to presume, that all the Nurses and Good-Women in *Glocestershire*, use his most awful Name, instead of *Raw-Head* and *Bloody-Bones*, to scare their Naughty Children into Good-Manners. But be that as it will : Who are the Persons that promote Discord and Animosities, instead of Peace and Good-Will amongst Men ? He may possibly have Brags sufficient in his Countenance to affirm, that they are the Clergy of the Church of *England*. But if he affirms any thing like it, it must be owing either to his Daring Front, or to his Egregious Folly and Ignorance of the Principles of the Church ; to which, by his way of Writing, we may safely pronounce him an utter Stranger. Rebellion, he can't but know,
is

is no Doctrine of the Church of *England*: And as to the Clergy's being the Occasion of Discords and Animosities, he may with as much reason charge him as an Incendiary, who endeavours to extinguish the Flame, that another with a Wicked Intention has kindled. But in order to put an end to our unhappy Differences, he wisely offers what follows.

P. 8. *The best and fairest way* (says he) *of Settling the Peace of the World, wou'd be to have no more Articles of Faith required to be assented to, than those that are expressed, without any Explanation, only in Words of Scripture.* And what Church, I desire to know, but the *Romish* (to which, whether he knows it or not, he seems to be nearest allied) pretends to set up any thing for an Article of Faith, but what may be found in expresse Words of Scripture, or is fairly deducible from it? When Heresies sprung up in the Church, some of the Ancient Creeds that were drawn up against them, we find varying in Expression, tho' not in Sense from Scripture; and the reason was this, that the most Rank and Pestilent Hereticks quoted Scripture for their Opinions; but Scripture misapplied, and misinterpreted: and on that very Account the Church was forced to fix a True and Genuine Sense, as a Test of Orthodoxy, in order to keep such Pests of Religion (whose chief Business was to Undermine and Sap the very Foundations of the Christian Religion, by denying the Author and Founder of it) out of the Pale of the Church.

We

We are told by (a) *Vincentius Lirinensis*, That all the Ancient Hereticks had a different Interpretation of Scripture, inasmuch as there were as many different Sences of the same Texts, as Heresies : “ *Novatianus* interpreting the Word “ of God one way ; *Photinus* another ; *Sabellius* “ another ; *Donatus* another ; *Arius*, *Eunomius*, “ *Macedonius* another ; *Jovinianus*, *Pelagius*, “ *Celestius* another ; and, in fine, *Nestorius* another : And on that account, (he tells us) “ it was requisite that there should be a Catholick “ Sence of Scripture established.

P. 10. *But are we Wiser than God ? He requires no more, than to Believe what he has Revealed, in the Words and Manner in which he has Reveal'd it.* And who, I shou'd be glad to know, requires more ? Does the Church of *England* ? If she does, 'twou'd be kind in this Gentleman, (who seems so much concern'd for the Spiritual Liberties of Mankind) to instance in the Particulars : And 'till he has done it, I shall take no farther notice of so General a Charge.

P. *ibid.* *I can't understand why a Man who really believes whas is revealed in Scripture, and will in those Words assent to it, can be justly branded with any Name of Infamy.* Neither can I, provided he gives his Assent to the Words of Scripture, in the same Sence and Meaning in

(a) *Advers. Hæres. cap. ii. p. 7. Edit. Oxon. 1631. Quia videlicet Scripturam sacram pro ipsâ suâ altitudine non uno eodemque sensu universi accipiunt: sed ejusdem eloquia aliter, atque aliter, alios atque alius interpretatur; ut pene quot homines, tot illic Sententiæ erui posse videantur, aliter namque illum Novatianus, aliter Photinus, &c.*

which they were revealed. But who, I pray, is to be Judge of this? every wild Pretender to more than common Sense, (tho' his Shallows are innumerable;) or the Governours of the Church, who are Authorized for that Purpose, and have a Right to Interpret Scripture, and declare the Faith of a Christian; not by an Absolute and Infallible, but a Competent Authority. By mistaking of which Distinction, our *Author*, as several others have done before him, has confounded the Authority of the Church allowed by all Christians, with that of its Infallibility, denied by all but the Papists. And because Unconditional and Absolute Obedience is due to none but God, nor has he delegated any such Power to Men; Will it therefore follow, that, in this respect, He has given no Power at all to his Church? As Christ has appointed Officers in his Church, to Govern it, which will be denied by none but downright Infidels; and as the Notion of Office, implies Power: so we may assure our selves, that the Clergy were never intended to be debarred of the Power of Direction. Nay, some Powers are appropriated in such a manner to the Chief Officers or Stewards of Christ's Church, (*Ambassadors* I dare scarce call them, for fear of giving Offence to this Right Worshipful Knight, and Doubty Disputant,) that they can't be exercised by those of the Lower Orders of the Church, much less the Laity: So this of Interpreting Scripture, (for which some of the Laity are by no means qualified) most certainly belongs to the Dispensers of
God's

God's Word and Sacraments. For the greater part of Mankind are Ignorant, and must depend upon the Judgment of others. Now, what wild Work, and strange Confusion wou'd it make, to leave it to every Man, Woman, or Child to pick out their own Faith from the Scriptures ! We shou'd have as many Religions then as Faces, and so many different Faiths. And suppose the Scriptures are a compleat Rule of Faith, (as they most certainly are ;) How shall we agree about the true Meaning and Interpretation of them ? We see every Sect quote Scripture, in Vindication of their Erroneous Opinions, and every one has his own Interpretation of it : And these are the Inconveniencies which necessarily attend the leaving every Man to follow his own Private Judgment. Which wou'd be a noble Claim, indeed, cou'd it be made out, and every Man was qualify'd for it. But I ask whether every Christian has a Capacity sufficient to judge for himself ? If he has not, (which, I presume, no Body will pretend to affirm ;) How can he have a Right to Judge, without a Capacity ? Or what will his Right signifie, if he does not know how to Apply it, or what Use to make of it ? If it be said, that every Man has a Right to Judge for himself, whether he has a Capacity, or not ; it is no more than saying, in other terms, that he has a Right to do what is impossible.

P. ib. The only safe Guide to direct and teach us the Will of God, is the Bible : As for the Fathers, Church-History, and Tradition, they are nothing more than Amusements, and help Men

with Matter to support their own Errours, and delude others. Say you so, good Sir? And who gave you an Authority in such Matters, above the Fathers? I find, (to make use of the Expression of (a) an Ingenious Writer, " You are " pleas'd to take no small Freedom with them, " upon a very small and slender Acquaintance." Are Those who were the immediate Successors of the Apostles, and had better Opportunities of Knowing the Will of their Lord and Master, than any at this distance of Time, (how Wise soever he may be in his own Conceit,) or Sir *Richard Cox*, who, I will take upon me to say, is as little skill'd in the Scriptures, as Fathers, and knows nothing of either of them, the most to be depended on? From the Testimony of the Fathers, we receive the Canon of Scripture, which is what no Man can pretend to determine, at this distance, without relying on the Authority of the Church, and Primitive Fathers: There are no Passages in *Holy Writ* that can give us Light in this Matter; no Text in the *Bible*, by which we can be certainly informed what Books are Canonical, and what not: And consequently, in this Point, Private Judgment must be forced to pay the greatest Submission to the Authority of the Church, as being the Channel through which the Canon of Scripture has been conveyed to us; and without which, Men cou'd never have found out those Laws by which they must be Judged

(a) Remarks upon the Bishop of *Bangor's* Treatment of the Clergy, and Convocation, p. 23.

by at the Last. And can we suppose that this Glorious Army of Martyrs, who look'd steadily upon their Faith with one Eye, and look'd Death and Danger out of Countenance with the other, cou'd be so wicked, as to Impose upon us in a Matter of so much Weight and Concern?

P. II. *I fear in our Church there is more Concern to be perceiv'd in the Successors of the Apostles, towards good Preferments, than there is Love to the Souls of Men, for whom Christ died.* Here we have a flaming Instance of this Gentleman's great Affection and Charity to the Church. If by *our Church*, he means the Church establish'd; tho' probably, after all, he may mean some Dissenting Conventicle; to which, if I am rightly informed, he is much more firmly attach'd: And if he affirms, that some Conventicle Teachers have more Regard to Private Views, and Secular Advantages, than to the Good of Souls; (tho' I am far from asserting that they are all so:) I will not pretend to gainsay him. Nay, granting farther, that some few of the Clergy of the Church of *England* may have such Views; ought this to redound to the Discredit of the whole Church, or it's Clergy? Because in the Number of Ten or Twelve Thousand, there may be some few, who are not in every respect so Good as they ought to be; will it follow, by a necessary Deduction, that all the rest are so too? Or, must the Good be involved in the Crimes of those that are Bad; and suffer in their Characters on that Account?

Because

Because a certain *Baronet* in *Glocestershire* is not so good in his Morals, or so well Principled as he ought to be ; Will it follow, that the rest of the *Baronets* in that County are Immoral, or Ill-Principl'd ? Because one Person, that shall be nameless, is an Infidel, or rather an Atheist ; will it follow, that all of the same Rank and Degree in his Neighbourhood, (tho' they fear God, honour the King, and live agreeably to God's Commands in all other respects) must be so too ? When Sir *Richard* has satisfied me in these Queries, I will return a farther Answer to his idle Supposition, and not till then.

P. 12. *The Lineal Successors of the Apostles, make the meanest of their Order, more than Princes, Ambassadors of Heaven.* But wherein do they do so ? Affirming without Proof, I give him my Word, will not serve the Turn. Because they are Obedient in all lawful Commands to Civil Magistrates ; Does it follow from thence, that they assume a Superiority over them ? Or, because they pay a more ready Regard and Obedience to the Will of Princes, than the Ecclesiasticks of any other Church, or pretended Church whatsoever, holding it a Sin to resist them ; Does it from thence follow, that they esteem themselves of Superiour, or ev'n Equal Degree with Princes ? Our Kings, indeed, out of their great Bounty have conferred several Favours upon the Church, and have given our Bishops the Title of Lords ; which, they have more Sence than to Claim as a Right adherent

to Episcopacy : They readily acknowledge, whatsoever they enjoy of this kind, to have stream'd from the Royal Munificence and Favour of the Civil Power. And this is, probably, what has given so great Offence. But if our Princes are the Fountain of Honour in this Kingdom, and from them all Civil Honour is derived ; and they have thought fit, to annex Baronies to Bishopricks ; Is this a greater Crime, than to grant Baronets Patents ; and to confer that Honour upon some of the Laity, not always the most deserving of it ? The Name *Ambassadour*, is no more than is expressly given them in Scripture ; it is no usurped Title, as this senseless Writer might have been convinced, had he ever read over his Testament. In 2 Cor. 5. 20. the Apostle takes upon him this offensive Title, *We (says he) are Ambassadors for Christ, as tho' God did beseech you by us : we pray you in Christ's stead be ye reconciled to God.* Which Mr. Pool (not the greatest Friend to the Church established, and on that account, I hope he will be more readily attended to by our Pamphleteer,) refers to those two Passages of our Saviours, *John 20. 21. Then saith Jesus unto them, Peace be unto you : as my Father hath sent me, so send I you :* and, *Luke 10. 16. He that heareth you, heareth me :* That is, As my Father authorizes me, so do I authorize you : and he that refuses to hear you, acting agreeably to such Authority, at the same time refuses my Authority, by which you are Commissioned. But lest our *Wise Author* shou'd

shou'd think, that this has no Regard to any, but such as were sent immediately by our Lord himself; St. Paul gives this Charge concerning *Timothy*, 1 Cor. 16. 10. *If Timotheus comes, see that he may be with you without fear: for he worketh the Work of the Lord, as I also do: Let no Man therefore despise him. And in another place, (viz. 1 Thes. 5. 12, 13.) We beseech you, Brethren, (says he to the Thessalonians) to know them who labour among you, and are over you in the Lord, and admonish you; And esteem them highly for their Works sake. And to the Hebrews, Obey them that have the Rule over you, and submit your selves: for they watch for your Souls, as they that must give an Account: Heb. 13. 17. Nay, St. Paul orders Titus to speak, exhort, and rebuke with all Authority: Tit. 2. 15. Which had been very improper, had the People been under no Obligation of Obedience to him. So that it is plain, that as the Title of Ambassador was assumed by the Apostles, and respected them as standing and perpetual Officers of the Church: The same Name may be warrantably admitted amongst their Successors, without any Priest-craft, or in the least assuming more State or Title, than properly belongs unto them.*

P. 4. *Can it possibly agree with the All-wise God, to place those Divine Powers in the basest and vilest of Men? If by Divine Powers, he means such miraculous Powers as were conferred upon the Apostles, and their immediate Successors; What Church, I should be glad to know,*
(unless

(unless the *Romish*,) pretends to any such Claim? But if he means, that it is not consistent with the Attributes of God, that such Men as our Clergy should be the Apostles Successors in their ordinary and standing Powers; I can't, without much better Reasons, come into his Opinion. But who, after all, are these vile People, that he takes upon him to stigmatize in this manner? Are they the Bishops? I hope he has more Prudence, than to affirm any such thing, for fear of being call'd to an Account for it: Are they the Inferiour Clergy? I hope he has more Grace than to assert, that many of them are of the *vilest* of the People; if by *vilest*, he means, that they are so in point of Morals. But supposing, for Argument's sake, that some few of them were really as bad as he represents them; Ought this, in Charity or Justice, to redound to the Discredit of the whole Order? There was one *Judas* amongst the Twelve Apostles, and yet I don't find that his Crimes were charged upon the rest of the Apostles. And there may be a vile *Bart.* in the County of *Glocester*, and yet his Brethren wou'd think it hard to have his Crimes laid to their Charge. But suppose he means *Vile*, in point of Pedigree; Does he not own, in the same Paragraph, *That our Saviour chose some of the Meanest of the Israelites to be his Apostles? to let us see, that it was not the Honours and Riches of this World, that chiefly recommended Men to the Favour of God.* So that if Men are otherwise Worthy of the Order of Priesthood, our

Saviour's Practice, according to his own reckoning, will sometimes justify their being taken out of the Lowest Rank of the People ; and the very Order it self will derive Honour upon the Person. But we'll put it upon another foot : Suppose a Man of Low Degree should be advanced to the Rank of a Baronet ; Wou'd his being of Mean Extraction, or Descent, make him less esteemed, provided he acted agreeably to the Station he was then in ? Wou'd it not be reckon'd a greater Credit to him, That by his Merit he had advanced himself ; than, if being Born to that Honour, he had acted below himself, and run into Opinions unworthy ev'n of the Lowest of the People, and suitable to none but such as were real Monsters in Nature ?

P. ibid. Can it agree with the Attributes of God, that it should be necessary, in order to support the Religion He taught Men, that our Priests should be obliged to derive their Pedigree from Idolaters, in order to enable them beneficially to administer the Sacraments ? Tho' I can't say it is absolutely Necessary from the Attributes of God, that it shou'd be so ; but that in Fact it has been so, I may take upon me to affirm. Christ tells us, That His Church is founded upon a Rock, and the Gates of Hell shall never prevail against it, Mat. 16. 18. and that it shall continue to the End of the World, Mat. 28. 20. yet for several Ages, 'till Light sprung up in the Christian World, not much more than a Century and a half since, Christianity was terribly clouded with Idolatry and Superstition : And yet the Regular

Regular Succession of the Clergy is so indisputable, that it does not deserve those Hard and Opprobrious Names with which our Author, and such-like Writers are pleased to brand it. For it is clearly to be proved against such Men, and all their Adherents and Abettors, both from the unquestionable Records of the Church, from the Reason of the Thing, and from the Nature of the Sacred Institution. For if ever the Regular Succession of the Priesthood had receiv'd any Interruption, there must have been a Time since the Apostles, in which there was not a Power of administering the Sacraments, or preaching the Gospel, or, in other terms, wherein there was no such thing as a Church. If so, then must our Saviour's Promise, of *being with the Apostles and their Successors to the end of the World*, Mat. 28. 20. have failed ; which I hope this Gentleman (with all his *Brass*) will not presume to affirm. It were no difficult Matter to prove from the Fathers, this Regular, Uninterrupted Succession. But I shall not insist upon this any further at present, knowing that such Authorities would be entirely thrown away upon so *bright* an Author.

P. *ibid.* Can it agree with them, that the Blessing the Bread and Wine by such wicked and sinful Men, should be more acceptable to him, than the honest sober Mind of a worthy Receiver ? They are both, most certainly, requisite to make the Sacrament acceptable, the due Administration by a Commissioned Hand, and the honest sober Mind of the Receiver : Nor can the Im-

morality or Intentions of the Administrator hinder the good Effects of the Sacrament, provided the Receiver comes duly prepared; agreeably to one of the Articles of our Church, (*viz.* the 26th) which runs in the following Words: “ Altho’
 “ in the Visible Church the Evil be ever mingled
 “ with the Good, and sometimes the Evil have
 “ the Chief Authority in the ministration of the
 “ Word, and Sacraments; yet forasmuch as they
 “ do not the same in their own Name, but in
 “ Christ’s, and do minister by his Commission
 “ and Authority, we may use their Ministry both
 “ in Hearing the Word of God, and in Receiving
 “ the Sacraments. Neither is the Effect of
 “ Christ’s Ordinance taken away by their
 “ Wickedness; nor the Grace of God’s Gifts
 “ diminished from such, as by Faith, and right-
 “ ly, do receive the Sacrament ministred unto
 “ them; which be effectual, because of Christ’s
 “ Institution, and Promise, altho’ ministred by
 “ evil Men.

P. *ibid.* I ask, whether it can consist with the Attributes of God, because a Wife, or a Friend, or a Servant has prevail’d with an Old Doating Fellow, to lay his Hand upon an Immoral Stupid Dunce, that by virtue thereof, such a Fellow shall be dubb’d with an Indelible Character? Here I can’t say, whether our Knight betrays more of his Ignorance, or Impudence: If he is not a stranger to Ordination in the Church of England, he can’t but know, that Orders are seldom or never conferred for such Ends, or with such Views. Why did he not instance in the Particulars,

culars (if he knew any) wherein they were so conferred ? The Reason is plain, because he cou'd not ; nor durst he do it : There is a thing call'd *Scandalum Magnatum* ; of the Meaning of which, his School-master of *Dumbleton* cou'd have inform'd him ; and from which his Title (had he laid himself liable) wou'd not have been able to have skreen'd him. But here he launches out, with an unbecoming Pertness, against the Indelible Character of the Clergy ; which has been defended by the Generality of the Fathers ; and those who were of a different Opinion, thought nothing less than the Sins of Heresy and Schism were capable of deleteing it ; of which a Person (a) very eminent for his Skill in Antiquity, speaks as follows : “ If by a *Bishop*, or “ *Priest*, be meant one that has receiv'd such “ an Ordination from the Church to the Office “ of Bishop, or Priest, as that if the Man turns “ Heretick, or Schismatick, or Apostate, or is “ Excommunicate, or Degraded ; yet his Ordination remains so far Indelible, and Inviolable, “ as that, if the Church thinks fit, after all his “ Crimes and Suspensions, to admit him, upon his “ Repentance, to officiate in that Station again, he “ shall need a New Ordination to qualifie himself “ for it: In this sence, there are none amongst the “ Antients but will allow Hereticks and Schismatics to be Bishops and Priests, according to “ their respective Orders. Some, indeed, were

(a) *Bingham's Scholastical History of Lay-Baptism, Part I.*
pag. 88.

“ against their being allowed to officiate in those
 “ Dignities, and were for depriving them wholly
 “ of those Honours, when they returned to the
 “ Catholick Church, as thinking them unworthy
 “ to enjoy those Privileges, who had so mani-
 “ festly prevaricated with the Church, and had
 “ gone contrary to the Designs and Duties of
 “ their Station : But None ever said, that
 “ if the Church should think fit to allow
 “ them to continue in their Service, she must
 “ of necessity give them a New Ordination.
 “ Thus far therefore they were allowed to be of
 “ the Clergy ; and upon this foot, many Churches
 “ and Councils accepted them upon their Re-
 “ turn, and permitted them to continue in their
 “ Offices without a Re-Ordination. And when,
 “ in the Discipline of the Church, it was thought
 “ proper to deprive them of the Power and Ho-
 “ nour of their Places ; yet even in that Case,
 “ the Church did not intend to deny the Vali-
 “ dity of their Ordination, but supposed that to
 “ remain still so entire, as that if ever after the
 “ Church should recall them to those Offices,
 “ she wou’d not do it by giving them a New
 “ Ordination. Which is largely insisted on
 “ by St. *Austin* (a) against the *Donatists*, and

(a) *Augustin. cont. Parmenian. Lib. 2. cap. 13. Tom. 7. Op.*
p. 41. Edit. Froben. Si visum est opus esse ut eadem officia gererent,
que gerebant, non sunt rursus Ordinandi, sed sicut Baptismus in eis,
ita Ordinatio mansit integra. — Ac cum expedire hoc Judicatur
Ecclesie ut Præpositi eorum, Venientes ad Catholicam Societatem, ho-
nores suos ibi non administrent ; non eis tamen ipsa Ordinationis Sa-
cramenta detrahantur, sed manent super eos.

“ St. *Jerome* (a) against the *Luciferians* ; both
 “ which Sects pleaded for the Invalidity of He-
 “ retical Ordinations ; but were refuted, upon
 “ this Principle of the Catholick Church, That
 “ Ordination, tho’ finfully given, if it was Valid,
 “ is not to be wholly annulled, or afterward
 “ repeated. In this fence Hereticks, Schisma-
 “ ticks, and Degraded Priests were allowed to
 “ be Priests still, and their Acts to be Valid,
 “ tho’ done Irregularly, Sinfully, and Unlaw-
 “ fully, against the Rule and Authority of the
 “ Church, to their own Destruction.

P. 14. *That must needs be a Poor Church, in-
 deed, that is not able to administer Necessary Sa-
 craments ; tho’ Mr. Rogers holds a Necessity of
 receiving the Sacrament from those that derive
 their Pedigree from the Apostles. And Dr. Ro-
 gers is most certainly in the right ; and of con-
 sequence, Mr. (I shou’d say, Sir Richard) Cox
 in the wrong. For what Authority has any
 Man to administer either of the two Sacraments,
 but such as derive their Authority from the
 Apostles ? It is not a Civil Right belonging to
 Men, either as Scholars, Gentlemen, or Mem-
 bers of Civil Society. If Christ instituted an
 Order of Men to perpetuate a Succession, and to
 administer the necessary Sacraments ; if any other
 Person should take upon him (without a Com-
 mission) to do what these, and only these have
 Authority to do ; Might not the Actions of such
 Persons be justly deemed Illegal and Null ?*

(a) Hieron. Dial. advers. Lucifer.

Suppose, for Instance, a Person who was not Free of a Corporation, shou'd take upon him to make others Free ; Wou'd they thereby obtain a Legal Freedom, warranted by Law and Charter, the Foundation of such a Right ? Or, Suppose a Private Person shou'd take upon him to Nominate a Lord Chancellor, and declare his Authority to be good ; Wou'd there be any thing but Impudence and Absurdity in it ? And why cou'd not he Sign and Seal as well in the King's Name, as an Uncommission'd Person in Christ's ? Nay, taking it in a lower Instance, Suppose Sir *Richard Cox* (who is, as I am informed,) not in Commission of Peace,) shou'd take upon him to grant Authority to another Person to Act in such a Commission : I desire to know why his Warrants might not be as Authentick, as the Ministerial Acts of a Person who has intruded (without a Commission) into the Office of the Ministry ?

P. 16. *As for Infant Baptism, it can be of no Signification ; for it can't agree with the Attributes of God, to Punish, or Reward us, when we have neither Merited, nor Transgressed.* And as to any other Institutions of Christ, I suppose he thinks them of no signification ; so it signifies not much, to argue upon this Head with an Unbeliever ; tho' I am far from saying, that if a Child Dies Unbaptized, thro' the neglect of it's Parents, it can't be saved ; for Infants must be sometimes excepted from this necessity of Baptism, as being incapable of Knowing, and therefore of Transgressing the Command. Nor is this the Doctrine of our Church,

Church, that they shall be punish'd for the neglect of their Parents, all that our Church has declared, is this, in one of her Rubricks, " That it is certain by God's Word, that Children which are Baptized, dying before they " commit actual Sin, are undoubtedly saved. " And all that I can say, is, that if they die before Baptism, they are within the Benefits of Christ's Uncovenanted Mercies. Yet if our Saviour has laid such a stress upon Baptism, as to say, (a) *Except a Man be born of Water, and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of Heaven*; and in another place, (b) *He that Believes, and is Baptized, shall be Saved*; Why should we exclude Infants from the Benefit of Salvation? Does he suppose they will be in a State of Neutrality at the Last Judgment, and that there will be (agreeably to the Popish Tenet) a *Limbus Infantum*. If it was necessary for Children to enter into Covenant under the Law by Circumcision; Why not under the Gospel by Baptism? Our Saviour says, as above, that *except a Man be born of Water, and of the Spirit, he cann't* upon the Terms of the Gospel *be saved*. But Sir Richard Cox affirms, that there's no need of being born of Water, and of the Spirit; for a Person may be as soon saved without it, as with it. And which of the two must we believe; our Blessed Saviour, who neither can, nor will deceive us, or this wild Enthusiastick Baronet? If we are Chri-

(a) John 3. 5.

(b) Mark 16. 16.

stians, we must adhere to the Institutions of Christ: and tho' Infant Baptism cannot be proved from express Words of Scripture, yet it may by Deduction. For the Apostles received a Command to *Baptize all Nations*; and sure, by Virtue of that Commission, Children were not to be excepted. There are no exclusive Terms (that I find) in the Commission; and the subsequent Practice of the Primitive Fathers (who universally agree in the point of Infant Baptism) is the best Comment we can have upon our Saviour's Institutions. If Children had been excluded, we can't reasonably suppose that the Custom of Baptizing Infants wou'd have so universally prevailed, ev'n from the First. For had there been any Innovation in this Case, I can hardly imagine, but such Scrupulous Persons as the Primitive Christians were, wou'd have made as great a stir in this Case, as they did about the Observation of *Easter*. However, thus much is certain, that the Primitive Fathers had much better Opportunities of knowing the Apostles Mind for the Practice of Infant Baptism, than any of the Moderns can pretend to, for laying it aside. But this Matter has been so well defended by the judicious (a) *Hooker*, to whose Judgment he all along pretends to pay the greatest Deference, and other (b) *Learned Men*, that it wou'd be needless to multiply Particulars

(a) *Hooker's Ecclesiastical Policy, Edit. 1. p. 332.*

(b) *Wall's History of Infant Baptism.—The Mystery of Anabaptists, Unmasked; by Mons. D'Assigny, 1709. — Walker's Modest Plea for Infant Baptism, &c.*

upon a Subject, in which the Rational Part of Mankind are generally agreed; speaking of deducing the Doctrine of the Trinity by Collection.

P. 17. *This deducing by Collection, (says he) has been of the most pernicious Consequence, to disturb the Peace of the Christian World. And what other Method wou'd he follow, in several Cases? There are some things, (notwithstanding he clamours so much against this kind of Deduction) which cannot be proved otherwise. What other way wou'd he take to prove the Legal Observation of the Lord's Day, Sunday, or Christian Sabbath? There is no exprefs positive Command in the New Testament for the change of the Day from the Seventh to the First Day of the Week: and yet we deduce this by Collection, from Apostolical Practice; and he and every Body else (but the Jews) readily come in to the Change, and take this to be the particular Day in the Seven, which, in pursuance of the Fourth Commandment, is under the Gospel to be sanctified, and set apart for the more immediate Worship and Service of God. Again, our Saviour has left a Divine Command with his Church, that Bread shou'd be blessed, broken, distributed, and eaten; and at the same Time that the Cup shou'd be blessed, poured out, and drank in Remembrance of his Death and Passion. Now, at the time that our Saviour gave this Command, there were none present but his Apostles; nor, of Consequence, did he speak directly to any but them.*

From the Words of the Command, then, we cannot infer, that neither Lay-Men or Women had a Right to eat this Bread, and drink this Cup, but by Collection; for it is notorious, that it has from the very first been the Practice of the Universal Church, that all faithful Christians, who have once been Baptized, and come to Years of Discretion, were not only admitted, but enjoined frequently to partake of this Holy Ordinance: And from this Universal Practice, everywhere receiv'd thro' the whole Church, ev'n from the Days of the Apostles, we have sufficient Grounds to conclude, and accordingly it has been universally so concluded, that the Obligation extends not only to the Bishops, as the Apostles Successors, but to every Christian, so soon as he shall be capable of paying Obedience to it. But to bring the Matter nearer home, Sir *Richard Cox* is a meer Stranger to me: Now, what other way have I of deducing his Character, but by Collections from his Writings, which represent him to me as hideous and frightful enough; but I will say no more, for fear of heating him.

P. 18. *It is evident beyond all Contradiction, that Power, not Reason, makes the Heretick.* It is evident beyond all Contradiction, that Non-sense, not Good Sense makes what he calls the *Dunce*. But to let that pass; by his way of Reasoning, the Members of the Church of *England* in 1648, when both Monarchy and Episcopacy were subverted, were the Schismatics, and the Presbyterians the only Orthodox: In 1651 the Tables were turned, and then the Independents

dependents were uppermost, and of Consequence (by his way of Reasoning,) the only Orthodox, and all the rest Heterodox. But his Notion is as disagreeable to Reason as Religion ; (a) for Orthodoxy implies a Man's acting conformably to the Rule of Scripture, and right Reason. But according to Him, there can be no settled Rule, or Criterion, to distinguish the Orthodox from the Heterodox, but Power ; and what may be Orthodox one Day, may be Heterodox another. When the Popish Religion was uppermost, That was the only Orthodox Religion, tho' never-so Disagreeable or Inconsistent with the Word of God, the True Test, and Sure Mark of Orthodoxy. But how consistent this is, with what he says in the very next Page, " That *what is true one Day, is so another,*" I'll leave to his *Right Worshipful* self to determine, and will pass on.

P. *ibid.* I have read all Sides, and yet I confess ingenuously, that I understand nothing of any. And so it plainly appears, by his way of Reasoning. But after all, what a competent Judge of Orthodoxy must this Man be, who pronounces Sentence point-blank, in a Case, wherein he *ingenuously owns his Ignorance*, and says he understands not one syllable of the Matter? He, for several Pages together, takes upon him to

(a) Vid. Glossar. Du Fresne, Suicer. Thesaur., Phavorin. Lexicon, Stephan. Thesaur. Ling. Græc. & Lat., Calepin. Dictionar. Hexaglot. in Voc. Ὁρθόδοξ. & Orthodox.

be a Judge of Controversies, and yet at once forfeits his Claim to Infallibility, and in direct Terms owns his Ignorance. But this is not the only Inconsistent Thing in his Pamphlet, for every Paragraph almost abounds with Contradictions.

P. 21. He says, *The Wisdom of the Parliament, our visible Church, shou'd find out, and establish what is agreeable to the Revealed Will and Word of God.* That the Parliament is part of the Visible Church, I will not take upon me to deny; but it is a very small part indeed. But what a strange wild Notion is this, that our Author has taken up! 'tis Novel, and may be reckon'd one of the Fictions of his own heated Brain. Did the Parliament ever pretend to Ordain the Clergy, exercise Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction, or pass Ecclesiastical Censures, the allowed Privilege and Prerogative of our Church Governours? Did the Parliament, as such, ever take upon them to Preach, or Administer the Sacraments, or do any other Clerical Acts? They never claimed any such Right by Act of Parliament, or pretended that the Clergy's exercising these Powers, was a breach of Parliamentary Privilege. But here I can't think, after all, that he has given to *Cæsar* his due, no more than to God his: If by *Visible Church*, he meant, to vest the Supremacy in the two Houses; how wou'd *Henry* the Eighth, who threw off the *Pope's* Supremacy, and vested it in himself, and Successors, have taken it, to have had his Supremacy call'd in question by such an Insigni-

significant Person? Banishment, Fine, or Transportation wou'd not then have served his Turn: the denying of the Supremacy was (a) made Felony; and the benefit of the Clergy, (which this *righteous* Gentleman so much despises) after such a bold Assertion, wou'd thankfully, and almost upon any Terms have been accepted by him. But granting, for once, that he allows the King's Supremacy, and had only a mind to pay his Respects to the Parliament, of which he was once an *Unworthy* Member; What a great Complement wou'd he make the King, when he told him, that he was the Head of a Church, *whose Doctrines are Impious, Blasphemous, and Whimsical*, and not agreeable, or any ways consistent with the *Attributes of God*; *whose Clergy are Drunkards, Whoremongers, Plunderers of the People of God, Impostors, Immoral Stupid Dunces?*

P. 20. *We have lately seen an Immoral Stupid Dunce ramble thro' the Nation in his hot-headed manner, and received every-where almost with Divine Honours, &c. and for nothing more, than for Cursing the Protestant Succession.* But who was this *Immoral Dunce*? Why did he not name his Name, that we might have either submitted to the Character, if true; or deny'd it, if false? 'Tis to be hoped it was some Bosom Friend or Acquaintance of his own, because of the great

(a) 28 Hen. 8. c. 10. f. 7. 31 Hen. 8. c. 1. f. 14. See Gibson's Code, p. 31, 33.

Freedom he takes with Character. If not, I will take upon me to affirm, that this nameless Person is some very good Man, for otherwise he would scarce have incurred Sir *Richard Cox's* Displeasure: And it will be esteem'd a Credit to have his Ill Word, whose Tongue is no Slander. But after all, the Person whom he stigmatizes with the Title of *Immoral and Stupid Dunce*, may be Dr. *Sacheverel*, who is made a Butt for all the Profligate and Debauch'd Wretches in the Kingdom to shoot at. If he is the Person, why does he not tell us so in direct Terms, that he may be called to Answer it elsewhere, and in another way? For it is not convenient that a Person in so eminent a Station, and whose Character is unfulled in all other respects, but by the Unfavoury Breaths of such a Foul-mouth'd Writers, shou'd be traduc'd by every *Immoral Dunce*, who has nothing but Scurrility and Ill-Manners to recommend him.

P. 22. *We lost our Way when we parted with our Bible: Our only Guide is the Bible: If we wou'd safely Travel, we must go to our Guide the Bible.* Tho' the Word *Bible* is so often at his Tongue's end, yet he Writes as if he had never read one Syllable of it. For his *Bible* no where encourages such an unwarranted Liberty towards his Betters. The *Bible* orders him (a) to *speake Evil of no Man*, much less of so Sacred an Order as the Clergy: His *Bible*

(a) *James* 4. 11.

commands him (a) *to obey those that have the Rule over him, as those that watch for his Soul.* His *Bible* may convince him, that the Character of a Christian, is so far from engaging him to defame his Neighbour, that the Apostle says, *Being defamed, we intreat,* 1 Cor. 4. 13. And how far he has been conformable to his Bible, I will leave it to every one, from these Instances, to judge. But this brings to my Mind a Story of a Fanatick, who, in the Time of the Grand Rebellion, was what Sir Roger L'Estrange calls *Bible-Mad*, and used (like this Man) upon every Occasion to Ring Changes upon the Word *Bible*. Tho', 'tis probable, he neither understood, nor valued it one jot more than our *wise* Author. This sanctified Brother, when a Party of Cavaliers came to his House and demanded Twenty Pounds, readily gave it them; and when a Second Party came and demanded his Wife and Children, he paid as ready Obedience to their Demands; but when a Third came for his Bible, *My Bible*, (says he,) *I love my Bible; I'll not part with my Bible; I'll live and die with my Bible.* Which Story I will leave with our *Wise Sir Knight* to apply, and will proceed to the Consideration of the remaining part of his Pamphlet.

P. 23. *The Form formerly used in making Bishops in Ireland, was the Command of the Prince.*

Here I find our *wise* Author has not Brains sufficient to enable him to distinguish betwixt *Nomination* and *Consecration*; the Prince undoubtedly formerly Nominated the Person, and so he does still; but there was always a Subsequent Consecration, without which there cou'd have been no Bishop; as ev'n this *worthy* Author might have been convinced, had he been in the least versed in Ecclesiastical Affairs.

P. ib. *The Form used in England, is so far from being more Apostolical, that it is a meer Mockery, that can't agree with the Attributes of God.* I really blush at the unparallel'd Assurance and Confidence of this Man, in finding Fault with what, 'tis only odds, he has never look'd into; or if he has, he don't understand. But wherein, I should be glad to know, is our Consecration *meer Mockery*; or which of the Attributes of God does it intrench upon? If neither of these two Assertions can be made out, as I am confident they cannot, this Author is a Trifling Caviller, to say no worse of him, and unworthy of having the least shadow of an Argument thrown away upon him.

We shall hardly find any Inducement to make us believe that it will be more acceptable to God, to have an Estate enjoy'd by one of these Silly Creatures, (viz. the Bishops,) than by a Sober, Honest Christian, who serves God to the best of his Knowledge. The Murder is now come out; they are the Bishops Manours, and
fine

fine Estates, and the Rights of the Parochial Clergy, which this Silly Creature drops his Nose over, and wishes in his own Possession; and which occasion all this Outcry and Clamour. But is he so fond of his *Bible*, and yet cou'd never find there, that the Clergy were entitl'd to a Maintenance? He may possibly say, with his Friends the *Quakers*, that there is no exprefs Gospel Command for the Payment of Tythes. And 'tis evident (as is before observed,) that there is no exprefs Gospel Command for the Change of the Sabbath, from the Seventh to the First Day. But tho' 'tis probable, that there may be no Gospel Command, in direct, exprefs, and positive Terms, for the Payment of Tythes; yet there are Texts which imply as much, as what the Clergy plead for. What, I should be glad to know, does he think of *Luke* 10. 7. compared with *Matth.* 10. 10. where 'tis said, *that the Labourer is worthy of his Hire?* And of that other Passage, *1 Cor.* 9. 11. *If we (viz. the Apostles) sow unto you spiritual things, is it a great thing if we reap your carnal things?* *Gal.* 6. 6. Nay, there are some other Passages, which might be produc'd for the Proof of the Clergy's Right to Maintenance, but these shall suffice at present.

P. *ibid.* Mr. Rogers gives great Privileges to those that have felt the weight of the Bishop's Hand upon their Noddles; for, indeed, there's no more in it. Here again this wise Baronet will

be Wading beyond his Depth : What, Nothing convey'd by Ordination ? Then I find our Saviour's Commission to his Apostles was to no Purpose ; and Christianity is a meer Jest and Banter, contrived on Purpose by Politicians to keep the Vulgar in Awe. And this is what he has been driving at, in all his Scandalous Pamphlets. He thinks, if the Divine Right of Episcopacy cou'd be once set aside, and the Christian Priesthood once run down, that Christianity it self would not be long behind. For whatever tends to give People a Contemptible Opinion of the Clergy, does consequently so of their Administrations : And when once Ignorant People find the Fundamentals of the Christian Religion struck at with Impunity, it's odds if they don't herd with Men who are no Christians ; especially when they are instructed by such Men, That Priest-craft is Religion, and that Religion is meer Priest-craft ; That the Paying of Respect, or Tythes to the Clergy, is an Imposition upon their Understandings, and Pockets ; And to be a Member of the Church established, is to be no Christian.

P. ibid. I am mightily pleas'd with Mr. Rogers's comparing the Church to the Family of an Absent Lord. And the Reason of this is plain ; Because he wishes the Church Catholick was reduced to the size of a Private Family : for, like that Infamous Buffoon Harry Martin, he cou'd then be delighted with the Sight of
a Poor

a *Poor Parson*. Then Sir *Richard Cox* might do what was Right in his own Eyes, and Wrong in every one's else. Then the Tythes of *Dumbleton* wou'd revert into his own Hands : And then, as Religion wou'd be less Chargeable and Burthenfome, it wou'd be much more Beautiful and Comely in his sight. I remember, whilst a Clergy Man of Note in the City of *London* was Beautifying his Church, a Pragmatical Parishioner, much of Sir *Richard Cox's* size in Religion and Sence, chanced to come in, and made this wise Observation upon it, *That the Parson was always putting his Parishioners upon fresh and needless Expences ; and he verily believ'd, that there was something of Popery in the Painting of the Altar-Piece.* But when he was told by a Stander-by, That it was done at the sole Expence and Charge of the Rector ; he declared, almost with the same Breath, *That it was very Pretty, and vow'd that he did not perceive one dram of Popery in it.* Which proves from what Cause the unreasonable Clamours of such People proceed : Not from the pretended Immorality of the Clergy, the usual Topick of their wicked Railery and Ridicule ; but from the usual (tho small) Expence with which Religion is accompany'd : and to be free from the one, 'tis plain, that they wou'd readily quit all their Claim and Pretensions to the other.

And

And now I have done with our Doughty Disputant, whom tho' I have treated with a good deal of Freedom, yet this will be my Excuse, That he has treated the Clergy, nay, Christianity it self, with a great deal more. And when Men take upon them to Ridicule and Banter the Institutions of Christ, I can't see what Right they have to Civil Treatment. If St. Paul commands us, *with an Heretick*, not so much *as to eat*, 1 Cor. 5. 11. ; I shou'd be glad to know, what Claim any Man who makes it his business to Ridicule and Rail at Religion, can have to Courteous and Complaisant Usage ? And if St. Paul elsewhere commands us, *To mark them who cause Divisions, contrary to what we have learned, and avoid them*, Rom. 16. 17. ; sure, that Person, who does not only make it his business to Divide, but wou'd, (if we may presume to judge of his Intentions, by Collections from his Writings,) lay Religion wholly aside, and by that means at once put an end to all Religious Differences ; ought to be avoided as much, nay more, than the most Pestilent and Perverse Heretick. And as St. John (a) used Cerinthus, when he met him in the Bath, and fled out of it, for fear the Roof of it shou'd have fallen upon his Head ; or, as Polycarp (b) used

(a) Iren. lib. 3. p. 204. edit. Grabe.

(b) Iren. Id. ib.

Marcion, when he told him, That he knew him to be the First-born of Satan ; (so much did the Apostles and their Disciples fear the keeping Company with Hereticks, that they wou'd not Communicate ev'n in Word with Those whose who had Corrupted the Truth :) So shou'd every good Christian use such a Writer as Sir R—d C—ks ; avoid him as an Enemy to all Goodness, and Good Manners. Neither wou'd this be inconsistent with the Rules of Right Reason, the Law of Good Manners, or the Precepts of the Gospel.

F I N I S.



(55)

5 AP 58

6